



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself or by his authority, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE 19, 1857.

THE apparition of La Salette, already familiar to our readers, has again become the subject of judicial investigation in France.

Mademoiselle Lamerlière, it will be remembered, brought an action, in the civil court at Grenoble, against the Abbé Deléon and Cartillier (the authors of the book called "La Salette devant Le Pape," in which they undertook to prove that it was she who personated the Blessed Virgin on the mountain of La Salette, on the 19th September, 1846), in which she claimed 20,000 francs damages, but was defeated, with costs, on the 2nd May, 1855.

From the decision of this tribunal she appealed to the Imperial Court, and has been again defeated, and, in like manner, with costs. The judgment was pronounced on the 6th May (ult.), and is given shortly by the French journals in the following words:—

"The Court, having heard the arguments of M. Almeras Latour (the Attorney-General), and not finding it necessary to go into all the arguments used for Mademoiselle de Lamerlière, and which had failed, considers her appeal against the judgment given by the civil tribunal of Grenoble, 2nd May, 1855, and declares it to be unfounded—confirms the said judgment—orders that it should be carried out to its fullest extent, and condemns the appellant to a fine and costs."

The *Siècle* of the 10th May last refers to the subject, and discloses a new fact connected with it, that Mdlle. Lamerlière actually confessed to the Abbé Burnoud that it was she who played the part of the Virgin on that occasion, which appears to be likely to give rise to another legal inquiry before the civil tribunals. The announcement of the *Siècle* is as follows:—

"In a former article we promised our readers an edifying story, and we now fulfil our promise. But, first of all, and in order to avoid confusion, we clearly state the facts which, after eleven years, have again brought up the tricks and scandals from whence, armed *cap-a-pie* like ancient Minerva, issued the miracle of La Salette. Mdlle. Lamerlière appealed to the Imperial Court to reverse the sentence pronounced against her by the civil tribunal of Grenoble. The Salettins declared the first judges to be Voltairians, impious enemies of religion. What will they say now of the magistrates, who adopt and confirm all the points of the previous sentence? Law proceedings have now been commenced by the Abbé Deléon (whose writings, declared by the tribunal to contain no libellous matter, expose the whole affair) against the Abbé Burnoud, late superior of the Salette missionaries. The Abbé Deléon requests the tribunal of Vienne to declare false, calumnious, and defamatory, certain assertions of the Abbé Burnoud, to condemn him in 3,000*fr.* damages, and to prove that Mdlle. Lamerlière herself performed the apparition, of which shameless mystification the Abbé Burnoud was perfectly well aware. However distinct these two trials may be, they have a great analogy to each other. They are both destined to show up the falsehoods and cunning by which faith is led astray, and the trust and credulity of the people wrought upon."

For the sake of such of our readers as may not have seen our articles of April, 1853, Oct., 1854, June and July, 1855, and April, 1856, on this subject, we insert here the brief account of the matter as given by the *Siècle*:—

"It was on the 19th September, 1846, that the Holy Virgin—so say the Salettins—appeared on the mountain

of La Salette to a young boy and girl keeping their flock. Overcome by the heat, the children, according to custom, had gone to sleep in the cleft of a ravine. A sweet harmony, proceeding doubtless from a musical snuff-box, awoke the little sleepers, who, on opening their eyes, saw before them a fine lady robed in a splendid yellow dress, wearing varnished shoes and with a head-dress of ribbons and flowers, 'I am the Holy Virgin,' said the lady, and thereupon commenced a discourse, showing that all the evils in France came from the non-observance of the Sunday rest. The children heard, but understood not. The Holy Virgin had forgotten that the little peasants only spoke *patois*, but the Queen of Heaven could not be baffled by so trivial a circumstance. She recommenced her discourse in the purest idiom of Dauphiné. The children, according to her instructions, immediately noised the matter abroad. The news of the miracle was like a thunder-clap. Pilgrimages began, chapels arose, medals were struck, inns were opened, Salette water was sold—the very water concerning which an episcopal decision of 1847 affirms that it 'cures all diseases of the body, and converts all the most inveterate sinners who are made to swallow a few drops of it, even against their will.'"

Such is the account of the apparition and its results, as described in the Parisian journals. The same article then proceeds to narrate the circumstances out of which the new action has originated, and to comment upon it, as follows:

"One evening, January 11, 1855—and it is the Abbé Deléon himself who gives, in a pamphlet before us, the account which we now merely abridge:—One evening, the Canons Rousselot, Gay, Revel, and Gillos; a Jesuit, Valgalier; and Abbé Saunier, were dining together at M. Lamanché's, chaplain of Ursula. The miracle was the subject of conversation, and the articles of the *Siècle* and the incontestable right of Mdlle. Lamerlière to commence proceedings against us for libel were brought forward.

"If we are judged according to those articles,' said sorrowfully the Canon Rousselot, 'my lord (Bishop of Grenoble) is a swindler, and I am a teller of falsehoods.'"

"But if you are right,' answered his colleague, Canon Gillos, 'why submit to the insult, why not proceed against the journal and the author of the articles?'"

"I should be willing,' replied M. Rousselot, 'but Monseigneur opposes it!'"

"Why,' said the other, 'what do you fear? The expense? Appeal to the clergy; there is not a priest who, for the honour of his robe, would not send his donation with alacrity.'"

"That is not the point,' cried one of the priests, 'there is much thought necessary before entering on such a course.'"

"Thought!' said M. Gillos. 'Do the Lamerlière proceedings make you hesitate? What have you to fear from that woman? Are you not sure to command her?'"

"It is no easy thing,' said the Abbé Burnoud, superior of the Salette missionaries. 'She is compromising enough, and when you fancy you have got hold of her she escapes.'"

"I do not understand what you can have to fear from her,' sharply answered M. Gillos.

"She admitted to me,' humbly replied the Abbé Burnoud, 'that it was she who made the apparition.'"

"Judge of the general stupefaction; Canon Rousselot grew pale; looks of terror were exchanged; and, pressed to explain himself, the Abbé Burnoud added:

"I was conversing with Mdlle. Lamerlière, and expatiating on the success of the Salette pilgrimage. The churches,' said I, 'were deserted, the worship of the Virgin was forgotten. Now see how faith has awakened, how the worship of the Virgin increases and shines daily with more and more *éclat*. What a grand thing you did, and how it has spread.' To which Mdlle. Lamerlière replied, 'Did I not? Oh! I knew it well when I did it.'"

"This artless avowal threw the Abbé Gillos, one of the most learned and upright priests of the diocese of Grenoble, into consternation. In his straightforwardness, he marvelled that any one could support and make money of a miracle whose human origin they were acquainted with.

"The Abbé Gillos gives the details we have just summed up, and the Abbé Deléon offers to have their truth certified by oath before the tribunal of Vienne, where the proceedings he has commenced against the Abbé Burnoud are to take place.

"This, then, is the state of the case. A miracle is affirmed, and this miracle is a piece of knavery. Men have unworthily worked upon the most lofty and honourable sentiment which can fill a human soul—faith. Fabulously large sums have been collected; credulous populations have been enticed on pilgrimage; the water of La Salette has become an article of trade; and a bishop

We are informed that the title of the pamphlet referred to is, "Mémoire pour M. l'Abbé Burnoud, ancien supérieur des missionnaires de la Salette. Une brochure in 8vo., imprimerie de F. Blanc, a Grenoble, rue Bayard;" but we have not yet succeeded in procuring a copy of it.

"Elle m'a avoué, répond humblement alors M. l'Abbé Burnoud, que c'était elle qui avait fait l'apparition."

has been found to announce to Christendom that this water heals all diseases of the body, and converts all the most inveterate sinners who are made to swallow a few drops of it, even against their will.

"The heroine of this mystification had already gained some celebrity in 1848, in the clubs of Grenoble, Romans, and Valence. The Abbé Deléon says she was the general laughing-stock, singing and dancing with all her *cortège* around the tree of liberty, and her enthusiasm was such that the police were obliged to interfere and close her house, which was a permanent club. What an affront for the Virgin of 1846! Yes, there is a true miracle in it. Not in the apparition to the two children, Maximin Giraud and Mélanie Mathieu, who have both turned out far from well; but in the audacity shown in the past and present working to the best advantage of this knavish trick.

"How should religion bear up under such stunning blows inflicted upon her by the very men who call themselves her ministers and most zealous defenders!"—*Louis Jourdan, Siècle, May 10th, 1857.*"

We think any further comment upon this sad *exposé* than that of M. Louis Jourdan in the above paragraph would be superfluous. We feel for those honourable Roman Catholics who blush that any ecclesiastics of their Church should be involved in such an unholy traffic in sacred things, and we shall, therefore, merely add a single passage from another article in the same French journal, which shows how strongly the disgrace of such an imposture is felt in France by those who are not its dupes—

"If the doctrine of Christ—the doctrine of love and fraternity—could perish, it would be engulfed by such an impious avalanche as this."—*Siècle, May 6, 1857.*

### CHARGE OF THE ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX.

THE following extracts from the charge of the Venerable John Sinclair, M.A., Archdeacon of Middlesex, delivered at the visitation of the clergy of London, held in St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden, on the 4th inst., are, we think, well deserving of the attention of our readers. We regret that we have not space to reproduce the whole document in our pages:—

"Among the public documents which have lately issued from the Romish press there are not many so deserving of notice as the pastoral letter of Baron Ketteler, Bishop of Mentz, and in that capacity successor of St. Boniface, the apostle of the Germans. In this letter a passage occurs in which his lordship has instituted a comparison (and certainly it is a startling one) between the German Reformers casting off the yoke of Rome and the unbelieving Jews crucifying their Messiah. 'As the Jewish nation,' says the bishop, 'lost its vocation upon earth when it crucified the Messiah, so did the German nation forfeit its high vocation in the kingdom of God when it broke the unity of faith which had been established by St. Boniface.'"

"On reading this comparison I searched the context to see the grounds of it, but I searched in vain. His lordship did not think it necessary to produce the proofs of his allegation. I then considered, if a parallel must be drawn between the ancient Jews and any party in modern times, whether that modern party does not consist of the co-religionists of St. Boniface and the bishop rather than of the Reformers. I do not mean that I would charge the Romanists, as a body, with the guilt of crucifying the Messiah, as the Roman Catholic bishop accuses the Protestants of Germany; but I maintain that in another view there is between the Jews and the Romanists a wonderful correspondence, approaching almost to identity. The arguments of the Jews against Christianity and those of the Romanists against the Reformation are the very same; and the answer returned by the early Christians to Jewish cavils and objections forms the very answer which Protestants should return to the cavils and objections of their Romanist opposers. Thus, the Jew alleged the infallibility of his Church; so also does the Romanist. The Jew pleaded the antiquity of its doctrines and ordinances; so also does the Romanist. The Jew alleged the mean origin of Christianity as an objection to its truth; the Romanist makes the same objection to the Reformation.

"This parallel certainly is better founded than that of the Roman Catholic prelate, and it seems to me peculiarly adapted to meet the case, now too frequent, of persons who allow themselves to be overawed by the magnificent pretensions of the Church of Rome. It is astonishing with what facility susceptible and timid minds are led away by bold and confident assumptions. When they hear of a Church which claims the high attributes of 'unity,' 'antiquity,' 'universality,' 'infallibility,' and the exclusive possession of 'miraculous powers,' instead of inquiring, as common sense directs, into the grounds of these imposing pretensions—instead of 'proving all things,' as the Holy Scriptures enjoin, and 'holding fast that which is good,' they allow themselves to be persuaded that all inquiry is sinful; that to

'prove all things' is an act of in~~de~~l arrogance; that blind, implicit faith is their Christian duty; and that all use of reason or private judgment in matters of religion is a perilous abomination. Not even the blasphemous words addressed to the Roman Pontiff at his coronation:—'Take thou the triple crown, and know that thou art King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and vicergerent of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth,' can rouse the victim of Romish error, given up to 'strong delusions, that he should believe a lie.' In our endeavour, therefore, to recall him to his senses we have only one remaining resource. We may prove to him that had he acted eighteen hundred years ago upon the same principle of suppressing reason and submitting blindly to authority, he must have joined with the Jews in crucifying his Redeemer.

"1. In comparing for this good purpose the arguments of the Scribes and Pharisees with those of the Romish priesthood, we may first of all observe that the Jewish priests insisted on the infallible authority of their Church as a reason for rejecting Christianity. They reproached the early Christians with presumption in appealing to the law and to the testimony, against the presumed infallible decision of the high priest and Sanhedrim. 'Has not God,' they said, 'promised to our Church His sure guidance and protection? Is it not written, that in "Judah is God known, and His name great in Israel?" Has not God declared that in His house of Jerusalem He will put His name for ever, and that His eye and His heart shall be there perpetually? Do not you, Christians, yourselves admit that to us are committed the "oracles of God," and that to us "pertain the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the "promises." Can you deny that "ours are the fathers?" Is it conceivable that a Church so highly privileged, and so richly endowed, should fall into deadly error, and be cast off by the Almighty, and that a new society, a new Church, a new spiritual house, be built and consecrated in our stead? Above all, do you not read a positive injunction in the law itself, that when controversies arise, the decision of the Church should be implicitly submitted to? Is it not written—"If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment, and the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest, and unto the judge, even that man shall die."'

"In conformity with this Mosaic canon the Jews required the first Christians to acquiesce without reserve in the decision of the Church, met together under Caiaphas, the high priest, in Sanhedrim or general council. Jesus of Nazareth, they contended, must be renounced. The rulers of the Church were alone competent to determine when or where the Messiah was to be born. It was a matter too hard for laymen. How could laymen find out his birth-place? How could laymen tell whether he was to be a temporal or a spiritual prince? Let them consult their betters. Let them resort to persons more competent than themselves. 'Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people which knoweth not the law are cursed; that is, "cursed" when they would set up their own private judgment in opposition to the infallible authority of the Church. Let them not presume to think for themselves. Let them believe as the Church believes.

"Such, my reverend brethren, was the first head of argument employed by the Jews to fasten upon Christians the charge of heresy. Christians, in reply, denied the infallibility of the Jewish Church. They maintained that the high priest and Sanhedrim had erred. They appealed to Scripture as the rule of faith. We believe, they said, 'all things that are written in the law and in the prophets.' The boasted rule, 'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment,' does not, they added, enjoin our assent to any article of faith, but our submission to the award of the civil magistrate. The contumacy denounced is not 'heresy,' but 'disobedience.' 'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between stroke and stroke, thou shalt come unto the judge.'

"The early Christians further urged, in vindication of their reforming principles, that the Old Testament, so far from giving the Jewish Church any promise of infallibility, represented her, on the contrary, as prone to be deceived. The Old Testament made provision for a solemn sacrifice in case 'the whole congregation should sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly; that is, from the supreme council or Sanhedrim. The Old Testament recorded also numerous actual heresies and apostacies of the Jewish Church. Even in the days of undoubted inspiration the people 'corrupted themselves, and turned aside quickly out of the way which the Lord commanded them.'

"On this subject of fallibility and apostacy in the Church of Israel the reiterated complaints of Elijah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah are familiar to us all.

"These notorious heresies and apostacies were sufficient, as the first Christians insisted, to place beyond dispute the folly and presumption of the Jewish doctors in asserting the infallibility of their Church as well as their wickedness in putting Christians to death for denying it.

"In applying to modern times the arguments now considered, I may begin by observing that the Bishop of Metz and his co-religionists, when they attempt to

establish the infallibility of their Church, have an incomparably harder task than the Jews.

"The Romanists labour under this preliminary difficulty, that they have not yet been able to agree among themselves by what organ the infallible oracles are promulgated. This was a question never raised among the Jews. When Herod the King desired to learn the birth-place of the Messiah he had no difficulty in ascertaining to whom he should apply for authoritative information. He had recourse at once to the high priest and Sanhedrim, the universally acknowledged national council. He gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, and demanded of them where Christ should be born. And we do not read that either he or any other individual had afterwards the slightest doubt that he had consulted a competent tribunal. But among our Romish brethren there is no such happy unanimity. On the contrary, when we inquire in what quarter the infallible decisions are to be obtained, they are obliged to acknowledge that this important point has been for ages a subject of much dispute, and is a question very far from being yet infallibly determined. Various are the conflicting theories, the whole of which it would be needless to enumerate. Some learned Romanists are of opinion that infallibility is lodged in the Roman Pontiff, as successor of St. Peter. Others of equal learning are inclined to place it in a general council. A third party, not conceiving a Pope or council singly is infallible, ascribe infallibility to both in conjunction. And, fourthly, there are not wanting numerous and learned authorities who insist that even the decrees of a general council, ratified by the Pope, are not to be accounted infallible until they have been received by the Church universal. This admitted uncertainty as to the quarter of the earth towards which we are to look for infallible guidance is a ground of fair presumption, perhaps even of demonstration, that infallibility is in no quarter to be found.

"But supposing we overlook this preliminary difficulty, and proceed to ask the Romanist by what Scripture evidence he supports the pretensions of his Church, we are surprised to find him in great perplexity quoting the very passages in the Old Testament which the Jews, as we have seen, had recourse to, such as, 'In Judah is God known, and His name is great in Israel.' But it is not obvious that if these texts, as the Romanists themselves admit, do not demonstrate the infallibility of the Jewish high priest and his Sanhedrim, much less can they establish the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff and his cardinals?

"This inference is so clear that our Romish brethren seldom venture to support their cause by quotations from Holy Scripture. Their chief reliance is on general reasonings, technically termed motives of credibility. They insist upon the likelihood that God would grant His Church the privilege of infallible guidance. They try to satisfy us that He must of necessity have granted it, instead of bringing forward, as they ought, some evidence that He has actually granted it. What they affirm is, that God, having given to His creatures a revelation of His will, would not leave them afterwards to their own erring judgment in ascertaining the truths revealed. He would, of course, vouchsafe them an infallible living judge.

"But here again the reply at once occurs. In the case of the Jewish Church God unquestionably did what our Romish brethren inform us that He could not possibly have done. He gave the Jews a revelation of His will, and then did actually leave them to their own private judgment for ascertaining the truths revealed. And accordingly through an evil heart of unbelief they not only fell, as we have seen, into other grievous heresies and apostacies, but betrayed at last the strongest possible evidence of their liability to be deceived by rejecting and crucifying their own Messiah.

"With this glaringly erroneous decision before our eyes, a decision most solemnly given by God's Church more than eighteen centuries ago, how can any Christian pretend to maintain that God must of necessity at all times make His Church infallible?

"2. There is a second head of argument common to the Jews and Romanists. I refer to the great question of antiquity and identity. The Jews insisted that their Church was the original Church of God, unaltered in respect to doctrine and discipline since the days of inspiration. It could not, they contended, have been corrupted silently and imperceptibly to the extent complained of by Christians. 'You allege against us,' they said, 'that we have changed completely the religion taught by Moses and the prophets; that we have made void the law by our traditions, and that we teach for doctrines the commandments of men. We maintain, on the contrary, that these traditions and commandments have been handed down to us genuine and unaltered from the beginning. If not, when and by whom were they introduced. How came it that they spread so fast? How came it that none opposed them? Were the governors of the Church asleep for that long period? Among the rabbis and doctors of the law, men eminent for piety and learning, could not one champion of the truth be found till the present day, when you suddenly present yourselves as advocates of purity and reformers of abuses.

"The answer of the early Christians to this Jewish plea throws valuable light upon the progress of superstition. 'A period,' they affirmed, 'can be clearly pointed out when

these unscriptural principles and practices were unknown by which in later times the authority of the Divine law has been superseded—a period when the unlawful vows, the vain austerities, the pompous genuflections, the macerations of the body, the prayers in the public streets, the sanctimonious garb, and the ostentatious ablutions devised by Pharisaical hypocrisy were never heard of. The origin of these traditions can in general,' they said, 'be distinctly traced, and whether it can or not is unimportant. For though violent and sudden changes attract notice and produce disturbance, the case is otherwise with gradual alterations. A patient may recollect the very day and hour when he was struck down with an apoplexy or palsy; but he cannot specify the exact time when a consumption or an atrophy began. Superstition is to the body spiritual what a fever or an atrophy is to the body natural. It by degrees destroys the vitals of the patient, but is of such insidious growth as often to be imperceptible till past all cure. At first the way is made for it by some worthy but injudicious men, who devise methods of devotion different from the established usages of their Church. These novelties are eagerly adopted by admiring followers. The example spreads. Pride, and vanity, and love of notoriety outvie each other in the invention of new refinements. Every aspirant finds it necessary to acquire admiration as the contriver of some new garb, some new ceremony, some new posture in devotion, until at last common sense and sober-minded piety are overwhelmed, and crushed, and buried under a miserable accumulation of topperies and follies!'

"In applying this second head of argument to modern times, let me again remark that our Bishop of Metz and his Romish brethren have beyond comparison a weaker cause than the Jew. The Jew had some pretence for saying that his religion, preserved in written documents, and handed down by a Divinely appointed priesthood, could not have been silently and surreptitiously corrupted. No case in point could be alleged against him. But the Romanist is compelled to acknowledge that the Jewish Church is a notorious example of the very evil which he terms incredible. He must admit also that the Jewish Church was corrupted in a much shorter time than the period assigned by Protestants for the corruption of the Church of Rome. From the days of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi, when the Jewish Church was restored and purified by Divinely-appointed rulers and inspired prophets, till the nativity of our Lord, a period elapsed of about 420 years, and in that comparatively short period the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees spread itself so effectually as to corrupt the whole Church of Israel. But in the Church of Christ, from the death of the last Apostle, St. John, down to the beginning of the Reformation, a period intervened of not less than 1300 years. If, therefore, the Jewish Church became utterly corrupt in about four centuries, much more might the lapse of 13 centuries (many of them so infamous for war and carnage, ignorance and barbarism, as to be termed emphatically 'the dark ages') sufficiently account for the corruption we attribute to the Church of Rome.

"Our Romish opponents, therefore, can make nothing of this second argument, by which, in imitation of the Jews, they would support the lofty and unscriptural pretensions of their Church.

"3. To the resemblances already noticed between the arguments of Jews and those of Romanists, other circumstances of correspondence might be added, but I shall now confine myself to one further parallel.

"I refer to the identity of the objections made by Jews and Romanists to the quarter from which the reformation of their respective Churches proceeded. The Jewish doctors spoke with contempt of Christianity as an innovation introduced by mean and ignorant persons. They despised the Christians as well as hated them. 'You are illiterate men,' they said, 'of no reputation, of no authority, and your Master, the Nazarene, was of a rank in life as humble as your own. Is not His mother called Mary? and His brethren, James, and Joseph and Simon, and Judas? and His sisters, are they not all with us? Whence hath this man all these things? And is it not notorious that this man did not, like holy men of old, retire from the world, but ate and drank with publicans and sinners? On the other hand, our Scribes and Pharisees are persons of education and distinction, of exemplary strictness, of austere, unbending sanctity. They fast often. They scrupulously pay their tithes, even on the minutest articles. They never omit an appointed sacrifice. They practise the most painful mortifications; they make long and frequent prayers at certain hours, and in whatever spot these hours may chance to overtake them, whether in the synagogues or in the corners of the streets. Is it possible that such grave and long established authorities should be all in the wrong, and you upstart Galilean reformers in the right?'

"The great object of Christian reasoners in their reply to these Jewish allegations was to prove that Jesus of Nazareth, however humble His circumstances, was the true Messiah—the prophet like unto Moses who was to restore all things. For this purpose they showed that in Him were united all the marks by which the Messiah was to be known. And, although He chose for His followers persons in the same humble condition with Himself, yet this ground of prejudice has been anticipated by the prediction of Isaiah, that to 'the poor' especially 'the

Gospel should be preached." Nor was there any force in the objection that our Lord and His apostles charitably conversed with publicans and sinners, exhorting them to repentance. The conduct of the Saviour of men in this respect presented an admirable contrast to the sanctimonious exclusiveness of the Scribes and Pharisees.

"In applying these remarks, my reverend brethren, to our own days, we have a third time occasion to observe the weakness of the Romish argument in comparison with the Jewish. For when the Romanist objects to the mean origin of the Reformation, he must nevertheless acknowledge that the corresponding question of the Jews, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' does admit a satisfactory reply.

"And since Jesus of Nazareth claimed to be the Messiah, and His apostles to be messengers of God, it was necessary for Him to show the marks of His Messiahship; and for them to exhibit the credentials of their Divine mission. But the case of our reformers is wholly different. We do not maintain their coming to have been foretold and described in Holy Scripture. We do not say they were inspired. If, therefore, the advocate of Romanism could establish all the calumnies he desires to heap upon them, he would make but little progress in his argument. For it is not on the ecclesiastical authority, nor on the secular distinction, nor on the moral qualities of our reformers that we rest our Protestant faith; but on the force of their reasonings and the validity of their appeals to Scripture. When, therefore, the Romanist attempts to vilify our reformers, adverting to the low origin of one, to the ambition of another, and to the tergiversations of many, he wanders from the real question. The real question is, which of the two systems, the Popery of the Romish Church, or the Protestantism of ours, is more agreeable to Scripture? Is the Scripture favourable or opposed to human merit; to works of supererogation; to purgatory, pardons, and indulgences; to prayer in an unknown tongue; to invocation of saints; to worshipping of images and relics; to transubstantiation; to the adoration of the host, or consecrated wafer; to the sacrifice of the mass for the living and for the dead; and to the Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin, and her enthronisation as the Queen of Heaven? The decision of God's Holy Word with reference to these disputed points is the question to be settled, and not the rank, the station, or the moral character of our reformers.

"At the same time, in justice to these chosen objects of Papal vituperation, we know, my reverend brethren, that nothing could be easier than to place, if necessary, beyond dispute, the piety, the zeal, the disinterestedness, the Christian firmness and consistency, of those great benefactors of mankind, to whose labours and sacrifices, and resistance unto blood, we are, under God, indebted for the inestimable blessing of emancipation from Papal bondage. We might, indeed, with infinite advantage, contrast their exemplary piety and integrity through life, and their constancy in death, with the pious frauds, the Pharisaical hypocrisy, and the relentless cruelty of their persecutors, whom every respectable Roman Catholic in the present day we may hope is thoroughly ashamed of.

"I have now, my rev. brethren, completed my intended parallel between the arguments of the Jews against Christianity and those of the Romanists against the Reformation; and have, I trust, sufficiently demonstrated that the reasonings of the Romanists differ from those of the Jews only in being weaker and more untenable. Your familiarity with the Popish controversy will show you that these reasonings, weak and untenable as they are, comprise the whole strength and substance of the Romish cause.

## Correspondence.

### INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—You deny (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, May, 1857, page 38) that you have ever accused Roman Catholics of "repudiating God and Christ," and of "exploding the worship of God and Christ," &c.; these, you say, are charges which you "never made." But these charges are stereotyped indelibly in your own words, and no gloss, no artifice, no species of sophistry can alter their obvious, literal application. You say, indeed, "We never denied that Roman Catholics made prayers to God—we never denied that they use the mediation of Christ;" but this admission is merely delusive, an *argumentum ad captandam*, which you contradict by adding, "but we say that in addition they use the mediation of others to approach to Christ, whom they represent as too far removed from us by His divinity to approach, without the interposition of some other." But all this is directly at variance with what you assert (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, page 28, col. 2, 3), of our practice; not a word there about "the mediation of others to approach to Christ" for us; but that "He is so far removed from us that we require some one who approaches nearer to our own nature"—that is, some other mediator with the Father; that "we need not go to other intercessors; we find all in Christ. He is able to hear and grant our petitions." Is not this an attempt to prove that we have rejected the mediation of Christ; that we hold He is not able to hear us? And

again you say, "By going to the saints and angels we may miss Christ; by setting up mediators to ourselves, we may lose the mediation of that divinely appointed Mediator." Not a word about the mediation of others to approach to Christ; but only "setting up mediators to ourselves;" and "setting forth the Virgin Mary and saints as in some sense our saviours," and that "we speak of them in terms of plainly idolatrous signification;" and yet you tell us you have never charged us with rejecting the worship of God and the mediation of Christ! Moreover, if it be true, as you say, "that, in addition to prayers to God," we "use direct prayers to the virgin and saints to bestow blessings upon us," what can be the object of our prayers to God? what need have we to pray to him? And if, at the same time that we ask the intercession of the saints, we, in addition, ask them directly to give us blessings, what can be the use of their intercessions, or with whom do we require this intercession, if they themselves give us blessings?—if we pray to them as "dispensers of grace, assistance, and safety?" To ask the intercession of the saints, and, at the same time, to ask them directly to give us blessings, assistance, salvation, &c., is downright nonsense; yet such is your strongest argument to prove that I have "put charges into your mouth which you never made."

I have observed (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1857, p. 45) that you accuse us "with offering the Eucharistic sacrifice to the saints; that we do alms-giving and other works of religion to please them—that we hold them to be practically omnipotent; and that in practice they are addressed by us 'as direct dispensers of grace, assistance, and safety.'"

Now, all this is more than sufficient to show that the charges which you deny have been justly preferred against you—that you have over and over again attempted by such unfounded assumptions to prove that we have rejected the worship of God and the mediation of Christ, and adopted the worship of the Blessed Virgin and saints instead thereof.

To prove this you asserted in the "illustration" (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1857) "that the Queen often has no choice but to appoint the person named by him" (the minister). But this you contradict by an amendment (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, May, 1857, p. 49), by which you prove "the Queen has a choice, and may, if she likes, refuse," &c.!! If the analogy intended to be conveyed by your illustration, in its first form, be correct, it goes to prove that we offer neither prayers nor worship to God, and that we hold the real power rests with the saints; but in the amended shape you insinuate that we should offer a mock service to God in the same manner as the aspirant to the ribbon does to the Queen, at the same time that he knows that "the real power rests with the minister," &c. To prove that we give the saints the worship which is due to God, and that we have, therefore, "exploded the worship of God and Christ," you cite (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, p. 34), "We fly to thy protection, holy Mother of God," &c., and again—"O sweet Virgin Mary and Mother of Mercy! I commit myself this day and evermore to thy peculiar protection, with most humble devotion. Place me near unto thee, and protect me from all my enemies, visible and invisible. Say unto my soul I AM THY SALVATION! Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may thy consolation in that tremendous hour rejoice my spirit. Thou canst do all things thou wilt in heaven and earth, nor can any resist thy will, for thou obtainest from the Almighty whatever thou seekest. Hear me, therefore, and receive my prayers, and despise me not when I confide in thy mercy." And lest there should be any doubt that by these passages you intended to prove that we worship the Blessed Virgin and saints instead of God, you add, "Such worship as this we assert to be due to God alone." Now, if we honour the saints with such worship as this which you assert to be due to God alone, and if the foregoing passages have been cited by you, and intended, even to their very *Italics*, to prove that we give the saints this supreme and absolute worship, how can you say that you have never accused Catholics of "repudiating God and Christ?"

I should have remarked that by the amended form in which you now submit your illustration you offer to your readers a fourth version of the invocation of saints, and which, like Pharaoh's kine, has devoured all its predecessors.

I heartily agree with you that "if any reader of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is ignorant what Roman Catholics really hold on this or any other subject it is certainly not your fault;" for surely no one could hope for information from you on this or any other point of Catholic doctrine when he sees you state such palpable contradictions and palm them on your readers as one and the same, and each as a true and genuine explication of this one point. You grant (No. for May) that "the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books is precisely in accordance with the doctrine of the Council of Trent" (Roman Catholic theory); and thus, at length, you concede that no difference exists between Catholic theory (the doctrine of Trent) and Catholic practice (the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books) in the invocation of saints. And in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. v., p. 46, you admit, as I noticed (vol. vi., p. 33), that "it would have been a misrepresentation of Roman Catholic doctrine (the doctrine of Trent) to treat

the saints as direct dispensers of grace," affirming, at the same time, that by this doctrine (Catholic theory) they are only "intercessors with God, or joint supplicants with us to obtain benefits from Him"—by the way in which either the saints or we can obtain anything from God—viz., by the Lord Jesus," &c. Again, you say (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, p. 34), "We have fully admitted over and over again that Roman Catholic theory (the doctrine of Trent) is that it is 'from God' that the saints derive whatever power they have of complying with the petitions addressed to them;" and hence it invariably follows that the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books is that it is from God the saints derive whatever power they have of complying with our petitions when we address them. Thus do you inadvertently (so powerful is the force of truth) demonstrate that we do not ask the saints directly to give us blessings; thus do you afford a rigid proof that the difference which you insinuate (No. for May, p. 59), as existing between the help and assistance (*open et auxilium*) of the saints, and their intercession, is purely imaginary, and a libel on our practice. I shall now offer a brief but faithful sketch of "the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books," which, as you say, "is precisely in accordance with the doctrine of Trent" (Catholic theory), taking for my guide a little book, THE KEY OF HEAVEN. The first practical direction, page 1, is to begin the day, as soon as you awake, "with imploring God's grace, and thanking Him sincerely for the repose of the night." The second, "That the Church regards the saints merely as advocates of intercession, and Christ as SOLE MEDIATOR OF ATONEMENT; and that we know the saints are not our saviours; that none of them can ransom us from sin and death; that they themselves have attained everlasting glory no otherwise than through the atonement of their and our common Saviour, Jesus Christ; and finally, that their intercessions, like those of our brethren upon earth, must be offered to God through the same Lord Jesus." In page 3, the morning devotions begin, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Blessed be the Holy and undivided Trinity, now and for evermore. Amen." Then, the invocation, "Come, O Holy Ghost, replenish my heart, and enkindle in it the fire of Thy divine love. Amen." And thus, in the contemplation of the ever adorable Trinity does every Catholic Christian begin, and offer up, not alone his morning and evening prayers, but every prayer of his whole life. I have already (No. for April, 1857, p. 45), disposed of your objection to the prayer, "I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin," &c. In page 13, we have "Hail! holy Queen, Mother of mercy," &c., which concludes with "pray for us;" and in pages 28 and 29, we invoke the Blessed Virgin about forty times "to pray for us," after which follows—"We fly to thy protection, O sacred Mother of God, &c., which concludes as usual with "pray for us." In pages 44 and 45 we invoke the saints about seventy times, and still it is to "pray for us." Hence, by the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books we have a decided proof that we do not "avowedly worship the saints with a religious worship, either by offering the Eucharist to their honour, by making vows to them, or doing alms-givings, and other works of religion to please them," as you assert (No. for March, 1857, p. 28); and, further, it is manifest that we ask no protection from the Blessed Virgin and saints but what they can obtain from God, by joining their prayers, requests, and kindly offices with ours, as fellow and living members with us of the holy Catholic Church.

And I challenge, not you (as you have admitted the conformity of the practice of Catholic prayer-books to the doctrine of Trent), but any one who attempts to deny it, to find a prayer to the Blessed Virgin and saints, either in the book now before me, or in any other Catholic prayer-book, which does not conclude with the words "pray for us," if not equivalently expressed therein. Again, from page 9 to 12, we supplicate Christ Jesus, at least seventy times, "to have mercy on us;" and from page 2 to 76 there are no less than forty-seven prayers which end with the words, "through Christ our Lord. Amen;" with many others addressed directly to our Saviour Himself. The principal prayers used in the Mass are all offered "through Christ our Lord," &c. I cite, from page 173, a portion of a prayer to Jesus, thus—"And if anything be wanting of true contrition to this my sorrow, may Thy sacred passion, O blessed Jesus, Thy precious blood, and infinite merits supply all the defects of my weakness, for it is in Thy death I place all my trust; through Thee I firmly hope to obtain pardon of all my sins. May the fire, therefore, of divine love now inflame my soul, and consume therein whatever is displeasing to Thy infinite goodness. Sanctify my heart—purify my affections and desires," &c. And again, page 186, the prayer—"In thee, sweet Jesus, I place all my hope, because Thou alone art my salvation, my strength, my refuge, and the foundation of all my happiness; and were it not for the confidence I place in thy merits, and in the precious blood wherewith Thou didst redeem me, I would not presume to partake of this banquet. Encouraged, therefore, by Thy goodness, behold I come to Thee as a poor and infirm sheep to its shepherd; as one sick to his physician; as a condemned criminal to his intercessor, that, as the true shepherd of my soul, Thou mayest strengthen me; heal me, as my physician; and as my merciful advocate, deliver me from the sentence of sin and death, &c. Have pity, therefore, on me, my Jesus, and save me; for thou forsakest none that place their hopes

\* We said "in honour of the saints," not "to the saints."—E. D. C. L.